UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE HONORABLE J. SPENCER LETTS, PRESIDING UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

) CV-90-2042-JMI)))	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Friday, October 25, 1991 Los Angeles, California

Motion to Recuse Judge Ideman

Terry Kramer, CVR
Official Reporter
United States District Court
419 United States Courthouse
312 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 680-1908

APPEARANCES:

For Church of Scientology International:

Cooley, Manion, Moore & Jones 21 Custom House Street Boston, Massachusetts 02110

BY: Earle Cooley Attorney at Law

For Church of Scientology of California:

Law Offices of William Drescher 23679 Calabasas Road, Suite 338 Calabasas, California 91302

BY: William Drescher Attorney at Law

-and-

Bowles & Moxon 6255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 2000 Hollywood, California 90028

BY: Kendrick Moxon Attorney at Law

APPEARANCES (continued):

For David Mayo & Church of New Civilization:

Law Offices of Jerold Fagelbaum 2029 Century Park East, Suite 3270 Los Angeles, California 90067

BY: Jerold Fagelbaum Attorney at Law

For David Mayo, Church of New Civilization, John Nelson, Harvey Haber, Vivien Zegel & Dede Reisdorf:

Bright & Powell 1090 Eugenia Place, Suite 200 Carpinteria, California 93013

BY: Gary Bright Attorney at Law

For Vicki Aznaran and Richard Aznaran:

Smith, Polson & Elstead 6140 Stoneridge Mall Road, Suite 500 Pleasanton, California 94588

BY: John Elstead Attorney at Law

APPEARANCES (continued):

For the United States of American:

Lourdes Baird United States Attorney 300 North Los Angeles Street Los Angeles, California 90012

BY: Richard Stack
Assistant United States Attorney

I don't know why it is there, but you may not draw 1 inferences about me from anything you can find sitting in my 2 chambers. 3 MR. COOLEY: I respectfully submit that that simply 4 5 is not so. But that is going to be a matter that is THE COURT: 6 going to be up to the judge, and I don't agree with you, so I 7 don't want to hear what's in the article. 8 The article is not pasted on his wall. The Time 9 magazine cover is someplace in his chambers, I take it. 10 suspicion is that if it were in his office, you would have 11 told me that, so I suspect it's not there. 12 MR. COOLEY: It's in his -- the working part --13 THE COURT: You have told me --14 MR. COOLEY: -- of his chambers --15 16 THE COURT: Wait a minute; stop. MR. COOLEY: He must --17 THE COURT: Stop. 18 I will have a marshal escort you out of here if you 19 don't stop when I tell you to stop. 20 MR. COOLEY: Well, I am not going to. If you want 21 the marshal to escort me out --22 Ms. Webb, will you call the marshal. THE COURT: 23 24 (Mr. Cooley exited the courtroom.)

church10.25 Motion to Recuse

25

THE COURT: Does anybody have anything to add to

it there. I simply don't believe that, so I don't credit it for that.

MR. MOXON: I see the Court's point.

As far as certainly we don't know what Judge

Ideman's state of mind is. He hasn't filed anything in
response, although it's my understanding that the papers have
all gone to him.

THE COURT: He has no opportunity to --

MR. MOXON: No obligation to, of course.

THE COURT: Not obligation, opportunity.

MR. MOXON: The point perhaps isn't then, Your Honor, what inference should be drawn, but in the standard of an extremely serious case, three cases that Judge Ideman is presiding over, whether or not there's an appearance, whether or not all these matters, Mr. Jeglikowski, the Time magazine, the other comments that have been made, whether or not they raise the appearance which should cause the Court in the position it's in with having to make very important decisions with respect to it, to millions of individuals who have faith in this religion, whether or not it wouldn't be better for the administration of justice to have some other judge preside who is not under this cloud, that's the only point, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand the point, and I don't think so, because these cases have been before Judge Ideman

church10.25 Motion to Recuse

for a long time, and there is the corresponding consideration that if it is true that what the Church of Scientology doesn't like about Judge Ideman is that reaction to the evidence that they've put before him, and that's why they want a different judge, the appearance of impropriety to the other people of allowing a change at this late stage is at least as high.

The law is clear that it has to be evidence and reason for bias that pre-exists the case itself, it cannot be things that come out of the case itself.

With a case that's gone on for a long time, there is always reason to ask the question if the real reason, if people want a change of judge, isn't because they have some inkling about what the judge thinks about what he's already seen abut the case.

That is not an appropriate basis for a recusal.

MR. MOXON: I agree, Your Honor; however, in this case we don't know how Judge Ideman acquired the viewpoint he has with respect to Scientology --

THE COURT: Indeed, I don't think you know that he has a viewpoint.

MR. MOXON: No.

Again, Your Honor, we haven't deposed Judge Ideman, and Judge Ideman has not spoken as to it, but the inferences here are substantial, there are so many of them that it

church10.25

THE COURT: I understand.

The question is, are the things you have asserted sufficient to believe there is a bias that doesn't result from the conduct of the case.

MR. MOXON: Yes.

THE COURT: And that question hasn't changed.

That's the question you posed by your papers, that's the question they addressed in their answer, and that's the question that I propose to decide.

MR. MOXON: I wish we could resolve this, the matter of some of the things that have come in. They clearly don't relate to the case itself, such as --

THE COURT: We're not going to hear any of those things. They're in the papers and I'm not going to hear more about them.

I'm not going to use the gavel again. There are other ways to not have that kind of conversation. I chose to use the gavel the first time.

MR. MOXON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. RATHBUN: Your Honor, just to address one point, you stated that you can't draw inferences, but in -- matter of fact from what you've stated, it's clear that you have drawn some inferences.

You stated that Time magazine is independent, and

Motion to Recuse

```
you also stated --
 1
             THE COURT: No, I didn't say that. I said it has
 2
    independent significance.
 3
             MR. RATHBUN: Independent -- how's that?
 4
             THE COURT: Time magazine is an entity, it's a
 5
 6
    magazine with a large circulation. It has independent
    significance that has nothing to do with this lawsuit.
 7
    That's what I said.
 8
             And I submit to you that you're exhibiting your own
 9
    bias when you hear me say that, because I didn't say that.
             MR. RATHBUN: No, I understand what you're saying
11
12
    now, but the same could be stated about --
             MR. BRIGHT: May I interrupt?
13
14
             THE COURT: Yes, you may.
             MR. BRIGHT: The defendants are objecting to Mr.
15
    Rathbun, who is not an attorney, addressing the Court.
16
             THE COURT: Sustained.
17
             You may not. I didn't realize that.
18
             MR. RATHBUN: Can I just make --
19
             THE COURT: You may not; you may not. I'm sorry.
20
             MR. RATHBUN: The other --
21
22
             THE COURT: You will stop, or I'll --
             May I have him escorted from the Court.
23
             (Mr. Rathbun removed.)
24
             THE COURT: You will now have a ruling.
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRAN-SCRIPTION, REPORTED TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITIES, OF THE PRO-CEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

> TERRY KRAMER CERTIFIED VERBATIM REPORTER

DATE